

Application No.: 10/622,853
Office Action: 05/13/2004
Amd Dated: 08/13/2004

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful search and examination and gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claim 16 would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form. The Applicant proposes herein amendments to conform the claims substantially to the form indicated to be allowable and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-21 have been cancelled without prejudice. Twenty-three new claims, 22-44, have been added. Therefore, claims 22-44 are now present for examination. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been included by this amendment and that the new claims are fully supported by the disclosure as originally filed.

New independent claim 22 is intended to substantially represent the former claim 16 in independent form. New independent claim 38 is intended to substantially represent the former claim 19 with the addition of limitations thought to be the reason for allowability of former claim 16.

New independent claim 30 is intended to substantially represent the former claim 17 in independent form. Notably, no prior art rejections were made with respect to former claim 17 in the Office action. The only objection to former claim 17 in the Office action was with respect to it depending upon former claim 16. Consequently, it is thought that new claim 30, essentially representing former claim 17 rewritten in independent form, should be allowable over the prior art of record.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 8-13, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,970,718 of Arnold ("Arnold"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's application of Arnold to the rejected claims.

Application No.: 10/622,853
Office Action: 05/13/2004
Amd Dated: 08/13/2004

However, for the sake of expediting issuance of the case, the Applicant has cancelled the rejected claims without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-7, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,470,263 of Lebovec et al. (“Lebovec”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,438,964 of Giblin (“Giblin”). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the characterization of the proposed combinations and the application of such proposed combinations to the rejected claims. However, again, for the sake of expediting issuance of the case, the Applicant has cancelled the rejected claims without prejudice.

**Request for Approval to Amend Drawings
Under 37 C.F.R. §1.121**

The Examiner objected to the drawings for shading and quality issues. Proposed replacement drawings are submitted herewith that are intended to address the Examiner’s concerns. The Examiner’s approval is respectfully requested for the proposed replacement drawings.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the newly added claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for claims 22-44.

Application No.: 10/622,853
Office Action: 05/13/2004
Amd Dated: 08/13/2004

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 607-3633 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Charge our Deposit Account

Enclosed is a PTO Credit Card Payment Form 2038 in the amount of **\$18.00** to cover the necessary additional claim fees. Please charge our Deposit Account No. **06-0029** for any additional charge deemed necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
Customer No.: 35657

By:



Michael A. DeSanctis, Esq.
Atty. Reg. No.: 39,957
Telephone: (303) 607-3633

Date: **August 13, 2004**

DNVR1:60274416.01